

Neutron Star Kicks and Asymmetric Supernovae

Dong Lai

Center for Radiophysics and Space Research, Department of Astronomy
Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853, USA
Email: dong@astro.cornell.edu

Abstract. Observational advances over the last decade have left little doubt that neutron stars received a large kick velocity (of order a few hundred to a thousand km s^{-1}) at birth. The physical origin of the kicks and the related supernova asymmetry is one of the central unsolved mysteries of supernova research. We review the physics of different kick mechanisms, including hydrodynamically driven, neutrino – magnetic field driven, and electromagnetically driven kicks. The viabilities of the different kick mechanisms are directly related to the other key parameters characterizing nascent neutron stars, such as the initial magnetic field and the initial spin. Recent observational constraints on kick mechanisms are also discussed.

1 Evidence for Neutron Star Kicks and Supernova Asymmetry

It has long been recognized that neutron stars (NSs) have space velocities much greater (by about an order of magnitude) than their progenitors'. (e.g., Gunn & Ostriker 1970). A natural explanation for such high velocities is that supernova explosions are asymmetric, and provide kicks to the nascent NSs. In the last few years, evidence for NS kicks and supernova asymmetry has become much stronger. The observational facts and considerations that support (or even require) NS kicks fall into three categories:

(1) Large NS Velocities ($\gg$ the progenitors' velocities $\sim 30 \text{ km s}^{-1}$):

- Recent studies of pulsar proper motion give $200\text{--}500 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ as the mean 3D velocity of NSs at birth (e.g., Lyne and Lorimer 1994; Lorimer et al. 1997; Hansen & Phinney 1997; Cordes & Chernoff 1998), with possibly a significant population having velocities greater than 1000 km s^{-1} . While velocity of $\sim 100 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ may in principle come from binary breakup in a supernova (without kick), higher velocities would require exceedingly tight presupernova binary. Statistical analysis seems to favor a bimodal pulsar velocity distribution, with peaks around 100 km s^{-1} and 500 km s^{-1} (Arzoumanian et al. 2001; see also Hansen & Phinney 1997; Cordes & Chernoff 1998).

- Direct evidence for pulsar velocities $\gtrsim 1000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ has come from observations of the bow shock produced by the Guitar Nebula pulsar (B2224+65) in the interstellar medium (Cordes, Romani & Lundgren 1993).

- The studies of neutron star – supernova remnant associations have, in many cases, indicated large NS velocities (e.g., Frail et al. 1994), although identifying the association can be tricky sometimes (e.g. Kaspi 1999; Gaensler 2000). Of special interest is the recent studies of magnetar–SNR associations: the SGR 0526-66

- N49 association, implying $V_{\perp} \sim 2900$ (3 kyr/ t) km s^{-1} , and the possible association of SGR 1900+14 with G42.8+0.6, implying $V_{\perp} \sim 1800$ (10 kyr/ t) km s^{-1} . (However, the proper motion of SGR 1806-20 may be as small as 100 km s^{-1} , and AXP 1E2259+586, AXJ 1845-0258, and AXP 1E1841-045 lie close to the centers of their respective remnants, CTB 109, G29.6+0.1, and Kes 73) (see Gaensler 2000).

(2) Characteristics of NS Binaries (Individual Systems and Populations): While large space velocities can in principle be accounted for by binary break-up (as originally suggested by Gott et al. 1970; see Iben & Tutukov 1996), many observed characteristics of NS binaries demonstrate that binary break-up can not be solely responsible for pulsar velocities, and that kicks are required (see also Tauris & van den Heuvel 2000). Examples include:

- The detection of geodetic precession in binary pulsar PSR 1913+16 implies that the pulsar's spin is misaligned with the orbital angular momentum; this can result from the aligned pulsar-He star progenitor only if the explosion of the He star gave a kick to the NS that misalign the orbit (Cordes et al. 1990; Kramer 1998; Wex et al. 1999).
- The spin-orbit misalignment in PSR J0045-7319/B-star binary, as manifested by the orbital plane precession (Kaspi et al. 1996; Lai et al. 1995) and fast orbital decay (which indicates retrograde rotation of the B star with respect to the orbit; Lai 1996a; Kumar & Quataert 1997) require that the NS received a kick at birth (see Lai 1996b).
- The observed system radial velocity (430 km s^{-1}) of X-ray binary Circinus X-1 requires $V_{\text{kick}} \gtrsim 500 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ (Tauris et al. 1999).
- High eccentricities of Be/X-ray binaries cannot be explained without kicks (Verbunt & van den Heuvel 1995).
- Evolutionary studies of NS binary population (in particular the double NS systems) imply the existence of pulsar kicks (e.g., Deway & Cordes 1987; Fryer & Kalogera 1997; Fryer et al. 1998).

(3) Observations of SNe and SNRs:

There are many direct observations of nearby supernovae (e.g., spectropolarimetry: Wang et al. 2000, Leonard et al. 2000; X-ray and gamma-ray observations and emission line profiles of SN1987A: McCray 1993, Utrobin et al. 1995) and supernova remnants (e.g., Morse, Winkler & Kirshner 1995; Aschenbach et al. 1995) which support the notion that supernova explosions are not spherically symmetric.

Finally it is of interest to note that recent study of the past association of the runaway star ζ Oph with PSR J1932+1059 (Hoogerwerf et al. 2000) or with RX 185635-3754 (Walter 2000) also implies a kick to the NS.

2 The Problem of Core-Collapse Supernovae and Neutron Star Kicks

The current paradigm for core-collapse supernovae leading to NS formation is that these supernovae are neutrino-driven (see Bethe 1990, Burrows 2000, Janka

2000 for recent review): As the central core of a massive star collapses to nuclear density, it rebounds and sends off a shock wave, leaving behind a proto-neutron star. The shock stalls at several 100's km because of neutrino loss and nuclear dissociation in the shock. A fraction of the neutrinos emitted from the proto-neutron star get absorbed by nucleons behind the shock, thus reviving the shock, leading to an explosion on the timescale several 100's ms — This is the so-called “Delayed Mechanism”. However, 1D simulations with detailed neutrino transport seem to indicate that neutrino heating of the stalled shock, by itself, does not lead to an explosion or produce the observed supernova energetics (see Rampp & Janka 2000). It has been argued that neutrino-driven convection in the proto-neutron star (which tends to increase the neutrino flux) and that in the shocked mantle (which tends to increase the neutrino heating efficiency) are central to the explosion mechanism, although there is no consensus on the robustness of these convections (e.g., Bethe 1990; Herant et al. 1994; Burrows et al. 1995; Janka & Müller 1996; Mezzacappa et al. 1998). What is even more uncertain is the role of rotation and magnetic field on the explosion (see Mönchmeyer et al. 1991; Rampp, Müller & Ruffert 1998; Khokhlov et al. 1999; Fryer & Heger 2000 for simulations of collapse/explosion with rotation, and Thompson & Duncan 1993 and Thompson 2000a for discussion of possible dynamo processes and magnetic effects).

It is clear that despite decades of theoretical investigations, our understanding of the physical mechanisms of core-collapse supernovae remains significantly incomplete. The prevalence of neutron star kicks poses a significant mystery, and indicates that large-scale, global deviation from spherical symmetry is an important ingredient in our understanding of core-collapse supernovae (see Burrows 2000).

In the following sections, we review different classes of physical mechanisms for generating NS kicks (§§3-5), and then discuss possible observational constraints and astrophysical implications (§6).

3 Hydrodynamically Driven Kicks

The collapsed stellar core and its surrounding mantle are susceptible to a variety of hydrodynamical (convective) instabilities (e.g., Herant et al. 1994; Burrows et al. 1995; Janka & Müller 1996; Keil et al. 1996; Mezzacappa et al. 1998). It is natural to expect that the asymmetries in the density, temperature and velocity distributions associated with the instabilities can lead to asymmetric matter ejection and/or asymmetric neutrino emission. Numerical simulations, however, indicate that the local, post-collapse instabilities are not adequate to account for kick velocities $\gtrsim 100 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ (Janka & Müller 1994; Burrows & Hayes 1996; Janka 1998; Keil 1998) — These simulations were done in 2D, and it is expected that the flow will be smoother on large scale in 3D simulations, and the resulting kick velocity will be even smaller.

There is now a consensus that global asymmetric perturbations in presupernova cores are required to produce the observed kicks hydrodynamically (Gol-

dreich, Lai & Sahrling 1996; Burrows & Hayes 1996). Numerical simulations by Burrows & Hayes (1996) demonstrate that if the precollapse core is mildly asymmetric, the newly formed NS can receive a kick velocity comparable to the observed values. (In one simulation, the density of the collapsing core exterior to $0.9M_{\odot}$ and within 20° of the pole is artificially reduced by 20%, and the resulting kick is about 500 km s^{-1} .) Asymmetric motion of the exploding material (since the shock tends to propagate more “easily” through the low-density region) dominates the kick, although there is also contribution (about 10 – 20%) from asymmetric neutrino emission. The magnitude of kick velocity is proportional to the degree of initial asymmetry in the imploding core. Thus the important question is: What is the origin of the initial asymmetry?

3.1 Presupernova Perturbations

Goldreich et al. (1996) suggested that overstable g-mode oscillations in the presupernova core may provide a natural seed for the initial asymmetry. These overstable g-modes arise as follows. A few hours prior to core collapse, a massive star ($M \gtrsim 8M_{\odot}$) has gone through a successive stages of nuclear burning, and attained a configuration with a degenerate iron core overlaid by an “onion skin” mantle of lighter elements. The rapidly growing iron core is encased in and fed by shells of burning silicon and oxygen, and the entire assemblage is surrounded by a thick convection zone. The nearly isothermal core is stably stratified and supports internal gravity waves. These waves cannot propagate in the unstably stratified convection zone, hence they are trapped and give rise to core g-modes in which the core oscillates with respect to the outer parts of the star. The over-stability of the g-mode is due to the “ ϵ -mechanism” with driving provided by temperature sensitive nuclear burning in Si and O shells surrounding the core before it implodes. It is simplest to see this by considering a $l = 1$ mode: If we perturb the core to the right, the right-hand-side of the shell will be compressed, resulting in an increase in temperature; Since the shell nuclear burning rate depends sensitively on temperature (power-law index ~ 47 for Si burning and ~ 33 for O burning), the nuclear burning is greatly enhanced; this generates a large local pressure, pushing the core back to the left. The result is an oscillating g-mode with increasing amplitude.

The main damping mechanism comes from the leakage of mode energy. The local (WKB) dispersion relation for nonradial waves is

$$k_r^2 = (\omega^2 c_s^2)^{-1} (\omega^2 - L_l^2) (\omega^2 - N^2), \quad (1)$$

where k_r is the radial wavenumber, $L_l = \sqrt{l(l+1)}c_s/r$ (c_s is the sound speed) and N are the acoustic cut-off (Lamb) frequency and the Brunt-Väisälä frequency, respectively. Since acoustic waves whose frequencies lie above the acoustic cutoff can propagate through convective regions, each core g-mode will couple to an outgoing acoustic wave, which drains energy from the core g-modes (see Fig. 1). This leakage of mode energy can be handled with an outgoing propagation boundary condition in the mode calculation. Also, neutrino cooling tends to




Fig. 1. Propagation diagram computed for a $15M_{\odot}$ presupernova model of Weaver and Woosley (1993). The solid curve shows N^2 , where N is the Brunt-Väisälä frequency; the dashed curves show L_l^2 , where L_l is the acoustic cutoff frequency, with $l = 1, 2, 3$. The spikes in N^2 result from discontinuities in entropy and composition. The iron core boundary is located at $1.3M_{\odot}$, the mass-cut at $1.42M_{\odot}$. Convective regions correspond to $N = 0$. Gravity modes (with mode frequency ω) propagate in regions where $\omega < N$ and $\omega < L_l$, while pressure modes propagate in regions where $\omega > N$ and $\omega > L_l$. Note that a g-mode trapped in the core can lose energy by penetrating the evanescent zones and turning into an outgoing acoustic wave (see the horizontal line). Also note that g-modes with higher n (the radial order) and l (the angular degree) are better trapped in the core than those with lower n and l .

damp the mode. Since the nuclear energy generation rate depends more sensitively on temperature than pair neutrino emission (power law index ~ 9), cooling is never comparable to nuclear heating locally. Instead, thermal balance is mediated by the convective transport of energy from the shells, where the rate of nuclear energy generation exceeds that of neutrino energy emission, to the cooler surroundings where the bulk of the neutrino emission takes place. Calculations (based on the $15M_{\odot}$ and $25M_{\odot}$ presupernova models of Weaver & Woosley 1993) indicate that a large number of g-modes are overstable, although for low-order modes (small l and n) the results depend sensitively on the detailed structure and burning rates of the presupernova models. The typical mode periods are

$\gtrsim 1$ s, the growth time $\sim 10 - 50$ s, and the lifetime of the Si shell burning is $\sim$ hours (Lai & Goldreich 2000b, in preparation).

Our tentative conclusion is that overstable g-modes can potentially grow to large amplitudes prior to core implosion, although a complete understanding of the global pre-collapse asymmetries is probably out of reach at present, given the various uncertainties in the presupernova models. For example, the O-Si burning shell is highly convective, with convective speed reaching 1/4 of the sound speed, and hydrodynamical simulation may be needed to properly modeled such convection zones (see Bazan & Arnett 1998, Asida & Arnett 2000). Alternatively, it has been suggested that the convection itself may provide the seed of asymmetry in the presupernova core (Bazan & Arnett 1998), although it is not clear whether the perturbations have sufficiently large scales to be relevant to supernova kicks.

3.2 Amplification of Perturbation During Core Collapse

Core collapse proceeds in a self-similar fashion, with the inner core shrinking subsonically and the outer core falling supersonically at about half free-fall speed (Goldreich & Weber 1980; Yahil 1983). The inner core is stable to non-radial perturbations because of the significant role played by pressure in its subsonic collapse (Goldreich & Weber 1980). Pressure is less important in the outer region, making it more susceptible to large scale instability. A recent stability analysis of Yahil's self-similar collapse solution (which is based on Newtonian theory and a polytropic equation of state $P \propto \rho^\Gamma$, with $\Gamma \sim 1.3$) does not reveal any unstable global mode before the proto-neutron star forms (Hanawa & Matsumoto 2000; Lai 2000). However, during the subsequent accretion of the outer core (involving 15% of the core mass) and envelope onto the proto-neutron star, nonspherical Lagrangian perturbations can grow according to $\Delta\rho/\rho \propto r^{-1/2}$ (independent of l) or even $\Delta\rho/\rho \propto r^{-1}$ (for $l = 1$ when the central collapsed object is displaced from the origin of the converging flow) (Lai & Goldreich 2000). The asymmetric density perturbations seeded in the presupernova star, especially those in the outer region of the iron core, are therefore amplified (by a factor of 5-10) during collapse. The enhanced asymmetric density perturbation may lead to asymmetric shock propagation and breakout, which then give rise to asymmetry in the explosion and a kick velocity to the NS (see Burrows & Hayes 1996).

4 Neutrino – Magnetic Field Driven Kicks

The second class of kick mechanisms rely on asymmetric neutrino emission induced by strong magnetic fields. Since 99% of the NS binding energy (a few times 10^{53} erg) is released in neutrinos, tapping the neutrino energy would appear to be an efficient means to kick the newly-formed NS. The fractional asymmetry α in the radiated neutrino energy required to generate a kick velocity V_{kick} is $\alpha = MV_{\text{kick}}c/E_{\text{tot}}$ ($= 0.028$ for $V_{\text{kick}} = 1000$ km s $^{-1}$, NS mass $M = 1.4 M_\odot$ and total neutrino energy radiated $E_{\text{tot}} = 3 \times 10^{53}$ erg).

4.1 Effect of Parity Violation

Because weak interaction is parity violating, the neutrino opacities and emissivities in a magnetized nuclear medium depend asymmetrically on the directions of neutrino momenta with respect to the magnetic field, and this can give rise to asymmetric neutrino emission from the proto-neutron star. Chugai (1984) (who gave an incorrect expression for the electron polarization in the relativistic, degenerate regime) and Vilenkin (1995) considered neutrino-electron scattering, but this is less important than neutrino-nucleon scattering in determining neutrino transport in proto-neutron stars. Dorofeev et al. (1985) considered neutrino emission by Urca processes, but failed to recognize that in the bulk interior of the star the asymmetry in neutrino emission is cancelled by that associated with neutrino absorption (Lai & Qian 1998a).

Horowitz & Li (1998) suggested that large asymmetries in the neutrino flux could result from the cumulative effect of multiple scatterings of neutrinos by slightly polarized nucleons (see also Lai & Qian 1998a; Janka 1998). However, it can be shown that, although the scattering cross-section is asymmetric with respect to the magnetic field for individual neutrinos, detailed balance requires that there be no cumulative effect associated with multiple scatterings in the bulk interior of the star where thermal equilibrium is maintained to a good approximation (Arras & Lai 1999a; see also Kusenko et al. 1998). For a given neutrino species, there is a drift flux of neutrinos along the magnetic field in addition to the usual diffusive flux. This drift flux depends on the deviation of the neutrino distribution function from thermal equilibrium. Thus asymmetric neutrino flux can be generated in the outer region of the proto-neutron star (i.e., above the neutrino-matter decoupling layer, but below the neutrinosphere) where the neutrino distribution deviates significantly from thermal equilibrium. While the drift flux associated with ν_μ 's and ν_τ 's is exactly canceled by that associated with $\bar{\nu}_\mu$'s and $\bar{\nu}_\tau$'s, there is a net drift flux due to ν_e 's and $\bar{\nu}_e$'s. Arras & Lai (1999b) found that the asymmetry parameter for the ν_e - $\bar{\nu}_e$ flux is dominated for low energy neutrinos ($\lesssim 15$ MeV) by the effect of ground (Landau) state electrons in the absorption opacity, $\epsilon_{\text{abs}} \simeq 0.6 B_{15} (E_\nu / 1 \text{ MeV})^{-2}$, where $B_{15} = B / (10^{15} \text{ G})$, and for high energy neutrinos by nucleon polarization ($\epsilon \sim \mu_m B / T$). Averaging over all neutrino species, the total asymmetry in neutrino flux is of order $\alpha \sim 0.2 \epsilon_{\text{abs}}$, and the resulting kick velocity $V_{\text{kick}} \sim 50 B_{15} \text{ km s}^{-1}$. There is probably a factor of 5 uncertainty in this estimate. To firm up this estimate requires solving the neutrino transport equations in the presence of parity violation for realistic proto-neutron stars.

4.2 Effect of Asymmetric Field Topology

A different kick mechanism relies on the asymmetric magnetic field distribution in proto-neutron stars (see Bisnovatyi-Kogan 1993; however, he considered neutron decay, which is not directly relevant for neutrino emission from proto-neutron stars). Since the cross section for ν_e ($\bar{\nu}_e$) absorption on neutrons (protons) depends on the local magnetic field strength due to the quantization of

energy levels for the e^- (e^+) produced in the final state, the local neutrino fluxes emerged from different regions of the stellar surface are different. Calculations indicate that to generate a kick velocity of $\sim 300 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ using this mechanism alone would require that the difference in the field strengths at the two opposite poles of the star be at least 10^{16} G (Lai & Qian 1998b). Note that unlike the kick due to parity violation (see §4.1), this mechanism does not require the magnetic field to be ordered, i.e., only the magnitude of the field matters.

4.3 Dynamical Effect of Magnetic Fields

A superstrong magnetic field may also play a dynamical role in the proto-neutron star. For example, it has been suggested that a locally strong magnetic field can induce “dark spots” (where the neutrino flux is lower than average) on the stellar surface by suppressing neutrino-driven convection (Duncan & Thompson 1992). While it is difficult to quantify the kick velocity resulting from an asymmetric distribution of dark spots, order-of-magnitude estimate indicates that a local magnetic field of at least 10^{15} G is needed for this effect to be of importance. Much work remains to be done to quantify the magnetic effects (especially when coupled with rotation) on the dynamics of the proto-neutron star and the supernova explosion (see, e.g., LeBlanc & Wilson 1970; Thompson & Duncan 1993).

4.4 Exotic Neutrino Physics

There have also been several ideas of pulsar kicks which rely on nonstandard neutrino physics. It was suggested (Kusenko & Segre 1996) that asymmetric ν_τ emission could result from the Mikheyev-Smirnov-Wolfenstein flavor transformation between ν_τ and ν_e inside a magnetized proto-neutron star because a magnetic field changes the resonance condition for the flavor transformation. This mechanism requires neutrino mass of order 100 eV. A similar idea (Akhmedov et al. 1997) relies on both the neutrino mass and the neutrino magnetic moment to facilitate the flavor transformation (resonant neutrino spin-flavor precession; see also Grasso et al. 1998; Nardi & Zuluaga 2000). More detailed analysis of neutrino transport (Janka & Raffelt 1998), however, indicates that even with favorable neutrino parameters (such as mass and magnetic moment) for neutrino oscillation, the induced pulsar kick is much smaller than previously estimated (i.e., $B \gg 10^{15} \text{ G}$ is required to obtain a 100 km s^{-1} kick).

It is clear that all the kick mechanisms discussed in this section (§4) are of relevance only for $B \gtrsim 10^{15} \text{ G}$. While recent observations have lent strong support that some neutron stars (“magnetars”) are born with such a superstrong magnetic field (e.g., Thompson & Duncan 1993; Vasisht & Gotthelf 1997; Kouveliotou et al. 1998, 1999; Thompson 2000b), it is not clear (perhaps unlikely) that ordinary radio pulsars (for which large velocities have been measured) had initial magnetic fields of such magnitude (see also §6).

5 Electromagnetically Driven Kicks

Harrison & Tademaru (1975) show that electromagnetic (EM) radiation from an off-centered rotating magnetic dipole imparts a kick to the pulsar along its spin axis. The kick is attained on the initial spindown timescale of the pulsar (i.e., this really is a gradual acceleration), and comes at the expense of the spin kinetic energy. We (Lai, Chernoff & Cordes 2001) have reexamined this effect and found that the force on the pulsar due to asymmetric EM radiation is larger than the original Harrison & Tademaru expression by a factor of four. If the dipole is displaced by a distance s from the rotation axis, and has components $\mu_\rho, \mu_\phi, \mu_z$ (in cylindrical coordinates), the force is given by (to leading order in $\Omega s/c$)

$$F = \frac{8}{15} \left(\frac{\Omega s}{c} \right) \frac{\Omega^4 \mu_z \mu_\phi}{c^4}. \quad (2)$$

(The sign is such that negative F implies $\mathbf{V}_{\text{kick}}$ parallel to the spin $\mathbf{\Omega}$.) The dominant terms for the spindown luminosity give

$$L = \frac{2\Omega^4}{3c^3} \left(\mu_\rho^2 + \mu_\phi^2 + \frac{2\Omega^2 s^2 \mu_z^2}{5c^2} \right). \quad (3)$$

For a “typical” situation, $\mu_\rho \sim \mu_\phi \sim \mu_z$, the asymmetry parameter $\epsilon \equiv F/(L/c)$ is of order $0.4(\Omega s/c)$. For a given Ω , the maximum $\epsilon_{\text{max}} = \sqrt{0.4} = 0.63$ is achieved for $\mu_\rho/\mu_z = 0$ and $\mu_\phi/\mu_z = \sqrt{0.4}(\Omega s/c)$. From $M\dot{V} = \epsilon(L/c) = -\epsilon(I\Omega\dot{\Omega})/c$, we obtain the kick velocity

$$V_{\text{kick}} \simeq 260 R_{10}^2 \left(\frac{\bar{\epsilon}}{0.1} \right) \left(\frac{\nu_i}{1 \text{ kHz}} \right)^2 \left[1 - \left(\frac{\nu}{\nu_i} \right)^2 \right] \text{ km s}^{-1}, \quad (4)$$

where $R = 10R_{10}$ km is the neutron star radius, ν_i is the initial spin frequency, ν is the current spin frequency of the pulsar, and $\bar{\epsilon} = (\Omega_i^2 - \Omega^2)^{-1} \int \epsilon d\Omega^2$. For the “optimal” condition, with $\mu_\rho = 0$, $\mu_\phi/\mu_z = \sqrt{0.4}(\Omega_i s/c)$, and $\epsilon = \sqrt{0.4} [2\Omega_i\Omega/(\Omega^2 + \Omega_i^2)]$, we find

$$V_{\text{kick}}^{(\text{max})} \simeq 1400 R_{10}^2 \left(\frac{\nu_i}{1 \text{ kHz}} \right)^2 \text{ km s}^{-1}. \quad (5)$$

Thus, if the NS was born rotating at $\nu_i \gtrsim 1$ kHz, it is possible, in principle, to generate spin-aligned kick of a few hundreds km s^{−1} or even 1000 km s^{−1}.

Equations (4) and (5) assume that the rotational energy of the pulsar entirely goes to electromagnetic radiation. Recent work has shown that a rapidly rotating ($\nu \gtrsim 100$ Hz) NS can potentially lose significant angular momentum to gravitational waves generated by unstable r-mode oscillations (e.g., Andersson 1998; Lindblom, Owen & Morsink 1998; Owen et al. 1998; Andersson, Kokkotas & Schutz 1999; Ho & Lai 2000). If gravitational radiation carries away the rotational energy of the NS faster than the EM radiation does, then the electromagnetic rocket effect will be much diminished (Gravitational radiation can also

carry away linear momentum, but the effect for a NS is negligible). In the linear regime, the r-mode amplitude $\alpha \sim \xi/R$ (where ξ is the surface Lagrangian displacement; see the references cited above for more precise definition of α) grows due to gravitational radiation reaction on a timescale $t_{\text{grow}} \simeq 19 (\nu/1 \text{ kHz})^{-6} \text{ s}$. Starting from an initial amplitude $\alpha_i \ll 1$, the mode grows to a saturation level α_{sat} in time $t_{\text{grow}} \ln(\alpha_{\text{sat}}/\alpha_i)$ during which very little rotational energy is lost. After saturation, the NS spins down due to gravitational radiation on a timescale

$$\tau_{\text{GR}} = \left| \frac{\nu}{\dot{\nu}} \right|_{\text{GR}} \simeq 100 \alpha_{\text{sat}}^{-2} \left(\frac{\nu}{1 \text{ kHz}} \right)^{-6} \text{ s}, \quad (6)$$

(Owen et al. 1998). By contrast, the spindown time due to EM radiation alone is

$$\tau_{\text{EM}} = \left| \frac{\nu}{\dot{\nu}} \right|_{\text{EM}} \simeq 10^7 B_{13}^{-2} \left(\frac{\nu}{1 \text{ kHz}} \right)^{-2} \text{ s}, \quad (7)$$

where B_{13} is the surface dipole magnetic field in units of 10^{13} G . Including gravitational radiation, the kick velocity becomes

$$V_{\text{kick}} \simeq 260 R_{10}^2 \left(\frac{\bar{\epsilon}}{0.1} \right) \left(\frac{\nu_i}{1 \text{ kHz}} \right)^2 \frac{1}{\beta} \ln \left[\frac{1 + \beta}{1 + \beta (\nu/\nu_i)^2} \right] \text{ km s}^{-1}, \quad (8)$$

where in the second equality we have replaced ϵ by constant mean value $\bar{\epsilon}$, and β is defined by

$$\beta \equiv \left(\frac{\tau_{\text{EM}}}{\tau_{\text{GR}}} \right)_i \simeq \left(\frac{\alpha_{\text{sat}}}{10^{-2.5}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\nu_i}{1 \text{ kHz}} \right)^4 B_{13}^{-2}. \quad (9)$$

For $\beta \ll 1$, equation (8) becomes eq. (4); for $\beta \gg 1$, the kick is reduced by a factor $1/\beta$.

Clearly, for the EM rocket to be viable as a kick mechanism at all requires $\beta \lesssim 1$. The value of α_{sat} is unknown. Analogy with secularly unstable bar-mode in a Maclaurin spheroid implies that $\alpha_{\text{sat}} \sim 1$ is possible (e.g., Lai & Shapiro 1995). It has been suggested that turbulent dissipation in the boundary layer near the crust (if it exists early in the NS's history) may limit α_{sat} to a small value of order 10^{-2} - 10^{-3} (Wu, Matzner & Arras 2000). The theoretical situation is not clear at this point (see Lindblom et al. 2000 for recent simulations of nonlinear r-modes).

6 Astrophysical Constraints on Kick Mechanisms

In §§3-5 we have focused on the *physics* of different kick mechanisms. All these mechanisms still have intrinsic physics uncertainties and require more theoretical work. For example:

(1) For the hydrodynamical driven kicks, one needs to better understand the structure of pre-SN core in order to determine whether overstable g-modes can grow to large amplitudes; more simulation would be useful to pin down the

precise relationship between the magnitudes of the initial asymmetry and the kick velocity;

(2) For the neutrino–magnetic field driven kicks, more elaborate neutrino transport calculation is necessary to determine (to within a factor of 2) the value of B needed to generate (say) $V_{\text{kick}} = 300 \text{ km s}^{-1}$;

(3) For the electromagnetically driven kicks, the effect of gravitational radiation (especially the r-mode amplitude) needs to be better understood.

We now discuss some of the astrophysical/observational constraints on the kick mechanisms.

6.1 Initial Magnetic Field of NS

The neutrino-magnetic field driven kicks (§4) require initial $B \gtrsim 10^{15} \text{ G}$ to be of interest. While magnetars may have such superstrong magnetic fields at birth (e.g., Thompson & Duncan 1993; Kouveliotou et al. 1998, 1999; Thompson 2000b), the situation is not clear for ordinary radio pulsars, whose currently measured magnetic fields are of order 10^{12} G . It is difficult for an initial large-scale 10^{15} G to decay (via Ohmic diffusion or ambipolar diffusion) to the canonical 10^{12} G on the relevant timescale of $10^3 - 10^7$ years (see Goldreich & Reisenegger 1992). However, one cannot rule out the possibility that in the proto-neutron star phase, a convection-initiated dynamo generates a “transient” superstrong magnetic field, lasting a few seconds, and then the field gets destroyed by “anti-dynamo” as the convection ceases. Obviously if we can be sure that this is not possible, then we can discard the mechanisms discussed in §4.

6.2 Initial Spin of NS

To produce sufficient velocity, the electromagnetic rocket effect (§5) requires the NS initial spin period P_i to be less than 1 – 2 ms. It is widely thought that radio pulsars are not born with such a rapid spin, but rather with a more modest $P_i = 0.02 - 0.5 \text{ s}$ (e.g., Lorimer et al. 1993). The strongest argument for this comes for the energetics of pulsar nebulae (particularly Crab). But this is not without uncertainties. For example, a recent analysis of the energetics of the Crab Nebula suggests an initial spin period $\sim 3 - 5 \text{ ms}$ followed by fast spindown on a time scale of 30 yr (Atayan 1999). As for the Vela pulsar, the energetics of the remnant do not yield an unambiguous constraint on the initial spin. Also, the recent discovery of the 16 ms X-ray pulsar (PSR J0537-6910) associated with the Crab-like supernova remnant N157B (Marshall et al. 1998) in the Large Magellanic Cloud implies that at least some NSs are born with spin periods in the millisecond range. So at this point it may be prudent to consider $P_i \sim 1 \text{ ms}$ as a possibility (see also §6.5).

6.3 Natal vs. Post-Natal Kicks

There is a qualitative difference between natal kicks (including the hydrodynamical driven and neutrino–magnetic field driven kicks) and post-natal kicks.

Because it is a slow process, the Harrison-Tademaru effect may have difficulty in explaining some of the characteristics of NS binaries (even if the physics issues discussed in §5 work out to give a large V_{kick}), such as the spin-orbit misalignment in PSR J0045-7319 (Kaspi et al. 1996) and PSR 1913+16 (Kramer 1999) needed to produce the observed precessions. For example, in the case of PSR J0045-7319 – B star binary: if we assume that the orbital angular momentum of the presupernova binary is aligned with the spin of the B star, then the current spin-orbit misalignment can only be explained by a fast kick with τ_{kick} less than the post-explosion orbital period P_{orb} . Similarly, a slow kick (with $\tau_{\text{kick}} \gtrsim P_{\text{orb}}$) may be inconsistent with the NS binary populations (e.g., Dewey & Cordes 1987; Fryer & Kalogera 1997; Fryer et al. 1998). However, note that $\tau_{\text{kick}} \sim \tau_{\text{EM}}$ for the Harrison-Tademaru effect depends on value of B [see eq. (7)], thus can be made much smaller than P_{orb} (which typically ranges from hours to several months or a few years at most for relevant binaries) if B is large.

6.4 Correlations Between Velocity and Other Properties of NS ?

Despite some earlier claims to the contrary, statistical studies of pulsar population have revealed no correlation between V_{kick} and magnetic field strength, or correlation between the kick direction and the spin axis (e.g., Lorimer et al. 1995; Cordes & Chernoff 1998; Deshpande et al. 1999). Given the large systematic uncertainties, the statistical results, by themselves, cannot reliably constrain any kick mechanism. For example, the magnetic field strengths required for the neutrino-driven mechanisms are $\gtrsim 10^{15}$ G, much larger than the currently inferred dipolar surface fields of typical radio pulsars; there are large uncertainties in using the polarization angle to determine the pulsar spin axis; differential galactic rotation is important for distant NSs and cannot be accounted for unless the distance is known accurately and the NS has not moved far from its birth location; several different mechanisms (including binary breakup) may contribute to the observed NS velocities (see Lai, Chernoff & Cordes 2001).

Recent observations of the Vela pulsar and the surrounding compact X-ray nebula with the Chandra X-ray Observatory reveal a two sided asymmetric jet at a position angle coinciding with the position angle of the pulsar’s proper motion (Pavlov et al. 2000; see <http://chandra.harvard.edu/photo/cycle1/vela/> for image) The symmetric morphology of the nebula with respect to the jet direction strongly suggests that the jet is along the pulsar’s spin axis. Analysis of the polarization angle of Vela’s radio emission corroborates this interpretation. Similar evidence for spin-velocity alignment also exists for the Crab pulsar. Thus, while statistical analysis of pulsar population neither support nor rule out any spin-kick correlation, at least for the Vela and Crab pulsars, the proper motion and the spin axis appear to be aligned. Interestingly, both Crab and Vela pulsars have relatively small transverse velocities (of order 100 km s^{-1}).

6.5 The Effect of Rotation and Spin-Kick Alignment?

The apparent alignment between the spin axis and proper motion for the Crab and Vela pulsar raises an interesting question: Under what conditions is the spin-kick alignment expected for different kick mechanisms? Let us look at the three classes of mechanisms discussed in §§3-5 (see Lai, Chernoff & Cordes 2001).

(1) Electromagnetically Driven Kicks: The spin-kick alignment is naturally produced. (Again, note that $P_i \sim 1 - 2$ ms is required to generate sufficiently large V_{kick}).

(2) Neutrino-Magnetic Field Driven Kicks: The kick is imparted to the NS near the neutrinosphere (at 10's of km) on the neutrino diffusion time, $\tau_{\text{kick}} \sim 10$ seconds. As long as the initial spin period P_i is much less than a few seconds, spin-kick alignment is naturally expected.

(3) Hydrodynamically Driven Kicks: The low-order g-modes trapped in the presupernova core ($M \simeq 1.4M_\odot$, $R \simeq 1500$ km) have periods of 1-2 seconds, much shorter than the rotation period of the core (unless the core possesses a dynamically important angular momentum after collapse), thus the g-modes are not affected by rotation. Also, since the rotational speed of the core is typically less than the speed of convective eddies ($\simeq 1000$ - 2000 km s $^{-1}$, about 20% of the sound speed) in the burning shell surrounding the iron core, rotation should not significantly affect the shell convection either. Thus the development of large-scale presupernova (dipolar) asymmetry is not influenced by the core rotation. But even though the primary thrust to the NS (upon core collapse) does not depend on spin, the net kick will be affected by rotational averaging if the asymmetry pattern (near the shock breakout) rotates with the matter at a period shorter than the kick timescale τ_{kick} . Here the situation is more complicated because the primary kick to the NS is imparted at a large radius, $r_{\text{shock}} \gtrsim 100$ km (since this is the location of the stalled shock). To obtain effective spin averaging, we require the rotation period at r_{shock} to be shorter than $\tau_{\text{kick}} \sim 100$ ms (this τ_{kick} is the shock travel time at speed of 10^4 km s $^{-1}$ across ~ 1000 km, the radius of the mass cut enclosing $1.4M_\odot$). Assuming angular momentum conservation, this translates into the requirement that the final NS spin period $P_i \lesssim 1$ ms. We thus conclude that if rotation is dynamically unimportant for the core collapse and explosion (corresponding to $P_s \gg 1$ ms), then rotational averaging is inefficient and the hydrodynamical mechanism does not produce spin-kick alignment.

The discussion above is based on the standard picture of core-collapse supernovae, which is valid as long as rotation does *not* play a dynamically important role (other than rotational averaging) in the supernova. If, on the other hand, rotation is dynamically important, the basic collapse and explosion may be qualitatively different (e.g., core bounce may occur at subnuclear density, the explosion is weaker and takes the form of two-sided jets; see Mönchmeyer et al. 1991; Rampp, Müller & Ruffert 1998; Khokhlov et al. 1999; Fryer & Heger 1999). The possibility of a kick in such systems has not been studied, but it is conceivable that an asymmetric dipolar perturbation may be coupled to rotation, thus producing spin-kick alignment.

It has been suggested that the presupernova core has negligible angular momentum and the pulsar spin may be generated by off-centered kicks when the NS forms (Spruit & Phinney 1998). It is certainly true that even with zero precollapse angular momentum, some rotation can be produced in the proto-neutron star (Burrows et al. 1995 reported a rotation period of order a second generated by stochastic torques in their 2D simulations of supernova explosions), although $P_i \lesssim 30$ ms seems difficult to get. In this picture, the spin will generally be perpendicular to the velocity; aligned spin-kick may be possible if the kick is the result of many small thrusts which are appropriately oriented (Spruit & Phinney 1998) — this might apply if small-scale convection were responsible for the kick. But as discussed in §3, numerical simulations indicate that such convection alone does not produce kicks of sufficient amplitude. Therefore, spin-kick alignment requires that the proto-neutron star have a “primordial” rotation (i.e., with angular momentum coming from the presupernova core).

Clearly, *if* spin-kick alignment is a generic feature for all NSs, it can provide strong constraints on the kick mechanisms, supernova explosion mechanisms, as well as initial conditions of NSs.

Acknowledgement

I thank my collaborators Phil Arras, David Chernoff, Jim Cordes, Peter Goldreich, and Yong-Zhong Qian for their important contributions and insight. This work is supported by NASA grants NAG 5-8356 and NAG 5-8484 and by a fellowship from the Alfred P. Sloan foundation. I thank the organizers for the invitation, and the European Center for Theoretical Physics for travel support to participate the “Neutron Star Interiors” Workshop (Trento, Italy, June-July 2000). This paper is also based on a lecture given at the ITP conference on “Spin and Magnetism in Neutron Stars” (Santa Barbara, October 2000). I acknowledge ITP at UCSB (under NSF Grant PHY99-07949) for support while this paper was being completed.

References

1. Akhmedov, E. K., Lanza, A., & Sciama, D. W. 1997, Phys. Rev. D, 56, 6117
2. Andersson, N. 1998, ApJ, 502, 708
3. Andersson, N., Kokkotas, K.D., & Schutz, B.F. 1999, ApJ, 510, 846
4. Arras, P., & Lai, D. 1999a, ApJ, 519, 745
5. Arras, P., & Lai, D. 1999b, Phys. Rev. D60, 043001
6. Arzoumanian, Z., Chernoff, D.F., & Cordes, J.M. 2001, in preparation.
7. Aschenbach, B., Egger, R., & Trumper, J. 1995, Nature, 373, 587.
8. Asida, S.M., & Arnett, D. 2000, ApJ, in press (astro-ph/0006451).
9. Atoyan, A. M. 1999, AAp, 346, L49
10. Bazan, G., & Arnett, D. 1998, ApJ, 496, 316
11. Bisnovatyi-Kogan, G. S. 1993, Astron. Astrophys. Trans., 3, 287
12. Burrows, A. 2000, Nature, 403, 727
13. Burrows, A., Hayes, J., & Fryxell, B.A. 1995, ApJ, 450, 830
14. Burrows, A., & Hayes, J. 1996, Phys. Rev. Lett., 76, 352

15. Chugai, N.N. 1984, *Sov. Astron. Lett.*, 10, 87
16. Cordes, J.M., Romani, R.W., & Lundgren, S.C. 1993, *Nature*, 362, 133
17. Cordes, J.M., Wasserman, I., & Blaskiewicz, M. 1990, *ApJ*, 349, 546
18. Cordes, J.M., & Chernoff, D.F. 1998, *ApJ*, 505, 315
19. Deshpande, A.A., Ramachandran, R., & Radhakrishnan, V. 1999, *A&A*, 351, 195
20. Deway, R. J., & Cordes, J. M. 1987, *ApJ*, 321, 780
21. Dorofeev, O.F., et al. 1985, *Sov. Astron. Lett.*, 11, 123
22. Duncan, R.C., & Thompson, C. 1992, *ApJ*, 392, L9.
23. Frail, D.A., Goss, W.M., & Whiteoak, J.B.Z. 1994, *ApJ*, 437, 781
24. Fryer, C., Burrows, A., & Benz, W. 1998, *ApJ*, 498, 333
25. Fryer, C. L., & Heger, A. 2000, 541, 1033
26. Fryer, C., & Kalogera, V. 1997, *ApJ*, 489, 244 (erratum: *ApJ*, 499, 520)
27. Gaensler, B.M. 2000, in “Pulsar Astronomy — 2000 and Beyond” (ASP Conf. Proceedings) (astro-ph/9911190).
28. Goldreich, P., Lai, D., & Sahriling, M. 1996, in “Unsolved Problems in Astrophysics”, ed. J.N. Bahcall and J.P. Ostriker (Princeton Univ. Press)
29. Gott, J.R., Gunn, J.E., & Ostriker, J.P. 1970, *ApJ*, 160, L91.
30. Grasso, D., Nunokawa, H., & Valle, J.W.F. 1998, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 81, 2412
31. Gunn, J.E., & Ostriker, J.P. 1970, *ApJ*, 160, 979
32. Hanawa, T., & Matsumoto, T. 2000, *PASJ*, in press.
33. Hansen, B.M.S., & Phinney, E.S. 1997, *MNRAS*, 291, 569
34. Herant, M., et al. 1994, *ApJ*, 435, 339
35. Harrison, E.R., & Tademaru, E. 1975, *ApJ*, 201, 447
36. Ho, W.C.G., & Lai, D. 2000, *ApJ*, 543, 386
37. Hoogerwerf, R., de Bruijne, J.H.J., & de Zeeuw, P.T. 2000, *ApJ*, in press (astro-ph/0007436)
38. Horowitz, C.J., & Li, G. 1998, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 80, 3694
39. Iben, I., & Tutukov, A. V. 1996, *ApJ*, 456, 738
40. Janka, H.-T. 1998, in “Neutrino Astrophysics”, ed. M. Altmann et al. (Garching: Tech. Univ. München) (astro-ph/9801320)
41. Janka, H.-T. 2000, submitted to *A&A* (astro-ph/0008432)
42. Janka, H.-Th., & Müller, E. 1994, *A&A*, 290, 496
43. Janka, H.-T., & Müller, E. 1996, *A&A*, 306, 167
44. Janka, H.-T., & Raffelt, G.G. 1998, *Phys. Rev. D* 59, 023005
45. Johnston, H. M., Fender, R. P., & Wu, K. 1999, *MNRAS*, 308, 415.
46. Kaspi, V.M., et. al. 1996, *Nature*, 381, 583
47. Kaspi, V.M. 1999, in *Pulsar Astronomy* (ASP Conference Series), ed. M. Kramer, N. Wex and R. Wielebinski (astro-ph/9912284)
48. Keil, W. 1998, in *Proc. of the 4th Ringberg Workshop on Neutrino Astrophysics* (Munich, MPI).
49. Keil, W., Janka, H.-Th., Müller, E. 1996, *ApJ*, 473, L111
50. Khokhlov, A.M., et al. 1999, *ApJ*, 524, L107
51. Kouveliotou, C., et al. 1998, *Nature*, 393, 235
52. Kouveliotou, C., et al. 1999, *ApJ*, 510, L115
53. Kramer, M. 1998, *ApJ*, 509, 856
54. Kusenko, A., & Segré, G. 1996, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 77, 4872
55. Kusenko, A., Segré, G., & Vilenkin, A. astro-ph/9806205
56. Lai, D. 1996a, *ApJ*, 466, L35
57. Lai, D. 1996b, in *Proceedings of the 18th Texas Meeting on Relativistic Astrophysics*, ed. A.V. Olinto et al. (World Scientific), p. 634 (astro-ph/9704134)

58. Lai, D. 2000, ApJ, 540, 946
59. Lai, D., Bildsten, L., & Kaspi, V.M. 1995, ApJ, 452, 819
60. Lai, D., Chernoff, D.F., & Cordes, J.M. 2001, ApJ, in press (astro-ph/0007272)
61. Lai, D., & Goldreich, P. 2000a, ApJ, 535, 402
62. Lai, D., & Goldreich, P. 2000b, in preparation
63. Lai, D., & Qian, Y.-Z. 1998a, ApJ, 495, L103 (erratum: 501, L155)
64. Lai, D., & Qian, Y.-Z. 1998b, ApJ, 505, 844
65. LeBlanc, J.M., & Wilson, J.R. 1970, ApJ, 161, 541
66. Leonard, D.C., Filippenko, A.V., & Ardila, D.R. 2000, ApJ, submitted (astro-ph/0009285)
67. Lindblom, L., Owen, B.J., & Morsink, S.M. 1998, Phys. Rev. Lett., 80, 4843
68. Lindblom, L., Tohline, J.E., & Vallisneri, M. 2000, astro-ph/0010653
69. Lorimer, D.R., Bailes, M., Dewey, R.J., & Harrison, P.A. 1993, MNRAS, 263, 403
70. Lorimer, D.R., Bailes, M., & Harrison, P.A. 1997, MNRAS, 289, 592
71. Lyne, A.G., & Lorimer, D.R. 1994, Nature, 369, 127
72. Marshall, F. E., et al. 1998, ApJ, 499, L179
73. McCray, R. 1993, ARA&A, 31, 175
74. Mezzacappa, A., et al. 1998, ApJ, 495, 911.
75. Mönchmeyer, R., Schäfer, G., Müller, E., Kates, R.E. 1991, A&A, 246, 417
76. Morse, J.A., Winkler, P.F., & Kirshner, R.P. 1995, AJ, 109, 2104
77. Owen, B.J., Lindblom, L., Cutler, C., Schutz, B.F., Vecchio, A., & Andersson, N. 1998, Phys. Rev. D, 58, 084020
78. Pavlov, G. G., et al. 2000, BAAS, 32, 733
79. Rampp, M., & Janka, H.-Th 2000, ApJ, 539, L33
80. Rampp, M., Müller, E., & Ruffert, M. 1998, A&A, 332, 969
81. Spruit, H., & Phinney, E.S. 1998, Nature, 393, 139
82. Tauris, T., et al. 1999, MNRAS, 310, 1165
83. Tauris, T., & van den Heuvel, E.P.J. 2000, astro-ph/0001015
84. Thompson, C. 2000a, ApJ, 534, 915
85. Thompson, C. 2000b, in Proceedings NATO Advanced Study Institute “The Neutron Star-Black Hole Connection”, ed. V. Connaughton et al. (astro-ph/0010016)
86. Thompson, C., & Duncan, R.C. 1993, ApJ, 408, 194.
87. Thompson, C., & Duncan, R. C. 1996, ApJ, 473, 322
88. Utrobin, V.P., Chugai, N.N., & Andronova, A.A. 1995, A & A, 295, 129
89. van den Heuvel, E.P.J., & van Paradijs, J. 1997, ApJ, 483, 399.
90. Vasisht, G., & Gotthelf, E.V. 1997, ApJ, L129
91. Verbunt, F., & van den Heuvel, E.P.J. 1995, in X-ray Binaries, ed. W.H.G. Lewin et al (Cambridge Univ. Press), p.457.
92. Vilenkin, A. 1995, ApJ, 451, 700
93. Walter, F.M. 2000, ApJ, in press (astro-ph/0009031)
94. Wang, L., Howell, D.A., Höflich, P., & Wheeler, J.C. 2000, ApJ, submitted (astro-ph/9912033)
95. Weaver, T.A., & Woosley, S.E. 1993, Phys. Rep., 227, 65
96. Wex, N., Kalogera, V., & Kramer, M. 2000, ApJ, 528, 401
97. Wu, Yanqin, Matzner, C. D., & Arras, P. 2000, ApJ, submitted (astro-ph/0006123)